

Corrigendum: The Conley conjecture for Hamiltonian systems on the cotangent bundle and its analogue for Lagrangian systems

Guangcun Lu *

School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University,
Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems, Ministry of Education,
Beijing 100875, The People's Republic of China
(gclu@bnu.edu.cn)

2 September, 2009

Abstract

In lines 8-11 of [12, pp. 2977] (arXiv:0806.0425 [math.SG], 3 Jun 2008) we wrote: “For integer $m \geq 3$, if M is C^m -smooth and C^{m-1} -smooth $L : \mathbb{R} \times TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the assumptions (L1)-(L3), then the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ is C^2 -smooth, bounded below, satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, and all critical points of it have finite Morse indexes and nullities (see [1, Prop.4.1, 4.2] and [3]).” However, it was recently proved in [2] (arXiv:0812.4364 [math.DS], 23 Dec 2008) that the claim of C^2 -smoothness of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ in [1, Prop.4.1] is only true if for every (t, q) the function $v \mapsto L(t, q, v)$ is a polynomial of degree at most 2, and that the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ is only C^{2-0} under the assumptions (L1)-(L3). So the arguments in [12] is only valid for the physical Hamiltonian in (1.2) and corresponding Lagrangian therein. Fortunately, the generalizations of Morse lemma in [8] or [10] can be used to overcome this defect. In this note we shall correct our arguments in [12] with a generalized Morse lemma in [8]. There also exists another method to overcome this difficulty, see [13](arXiv:0810.2108 [math.DS], 12 Oct 2008).

*Partially supported by the NNSF 10671017 of China and Research Fund for the Doctoral Program Higher Education of China (Grant No. 200800270003).

1 Jiang's generalization of Morse lemma

We only need a special case of the generalization of Morse lemma by Ming Jiang [8] (i.e. the case $X = Y$).

Let H be a Hilbert space with inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the induced norm $\|\cdot\|$, and let X be a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_X$, such that

(SP) $X \subset H$ and the inclusion is continuous.

For an open neighborhood W of the origin $\theta \in H$, $W \cap X$ is also an open neighborhood of θ in X . Suppose that a functional $\mathcal{L} : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions:

(FN1) $\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X} \in C^2(W \cap X, \mathbb{R})$.

(FN2) There exists $A \in C^1(W \cap X, X)$ such that

$$d(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(x)(\xi) = (A(x), \xi) \quad \forall x \in W \cap X \text{ and } \xi \in X.$$

(FN3) There exists a continuous map $B : W \cap X \rightarrow L(H, H)$ such that

$$d^2(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(x)(\xi, \eta) = (B(x)\xi, \eta) \quad \forall x \in W \cap X \text{ and } \xi, \eta \in X.$$

(These imply: $A'(x) = B(x)|_X$ and $B(x)(X) \subset X \quad \forall x \in W \cap X$. Such maps A and thus B are unique if X is dense in H .) By [8, Prop.2.1], (FN3) is implied in (SP), (FN1) and the following two conditions:

(FN3a) $\forall x \in W \cap X, \exists C(x) > 0$ such that

$$|d^2(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(x)(\xi, \eta)| \leq C(x)\|\xi\| \cdot \|\eta\| \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in X.$$

(FN3b) $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$ such that if $x_1, x_2 \in W \cap X$ with $\|x_1 - x_2\|_X < \delta$, then

$$|d^2(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(x_1)(\xi, \eta) - d^2(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(x_2)(\xi, \eta)| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi\| \cdot \|\eta\| \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in Y.$$

Furthermore, suppose also that

(CP1) The origin $\theta \in X$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X}$, 0 is either not in the spectrum $\sigma(B(\theta))$ or is an isolated point of $\sigma(B(\theta))$.

(CP2) If $\xi \in H$ such that $B(\theta)(\xi) = \eta$ for some $\eta \in X$, then $\xi \in X$.

The final condition (CP2) implies that $N := \text{Ker}(B(\theta))$ is contained in X . Clearly, N is closed in X and H , respectively. Let $N^\perp$ be the orthogonal complement of N in H , and $P : H \rightarrow N^\perp$ be the orthogonal projection. Denote by $X^\perp = X \cap N^\perp = (I_H - P)(X)$. Then there exist the following topological direct sum decomposition:

$$H = N \oplus N^\perp, \quad X = N \oplus X^\perp.$$

Theorem 1.1 ([8, Th.2.5]) *Under the above assumptions (SP), (FN1)-(FN2) and (CP1)-(CP2), there exists a ball B_δ^X of $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$, an origin-preserving local homeomorphism φ defined on B_δ^X and a C^1 map $h : B_\delta^X \cap N \rightarrow X^\perp$ such that*

$$\mathcal{L} \circ \varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}(B(\theta)x^\perp, x^\perp) + \mathcal{L}(h(z) + z) \quad \forall x \in B_\delta^X,$$

where $z = P(x)$ and $x^\perp = (I_X - P)(x)$.

Let $E(t)$ be the spectral resolution of the self-adjoint operator $B(\theta)$ on H . Since the spectrum $\sigma(B(\theta))$ is a bounded closed subset in $\mathbb{R}$, it follows from (CP1) that there exists a small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \cap \sigma(B(\theta)) \subset \{0\}$. Let

$$P^- = \int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon} dE(t), \quad P^+ = \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} dE(t), \quad P^0 = \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} dE(t).$$

Then $N = P^0(H) = H^0$ and $P = P^+ + P^-$. Denote by $H^\pm = P^\pm(H)$. Clearly, each linear subspace of X on which $d^2(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(\theta) < 0$ is contained in H^- . By an elementary functional argument we can get

Lemma 1.2 *If X is dense in H and $\dim H^- < \infty$, then $H^- \subset X$, i.e. H^- is the maximal subspace of X on which $d^2(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X})(\theta) < 0$.*

Definition 1.3 *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1.2, $\dim H^-$ and $\dim N$ are called the **Morse index** and **nullity** of $\mathcal{L}$ at $\theta \in H$, respectively, and still denoted by*

$$m^-(\mathcal{L}, \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0(\mathcal{L}, \theta).$$

Corollary 1.4 (Shifting) *Let θ be an isolated critical point of $\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X}$. Assume that $\dim N < \infty$ and that $H^- \subset X$ is of finite dimension. Then*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X}, \theta) = C_{q-j}(\mathcal{L}^\circ, \theta),$$

where $j := \dim H^-$ and $\mathcal{L}^\circ(z) = \mathcal{L}(h(z) + z) \ \forall z \in B_\delta^X \cap N$ as in Theorem 1.1. Furthermore, if θ is also an isolated critical point of $\mathcal{L}$, and X is dense in H , then

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}, \theta) = C_{q-j}(\mathcal{L}^\circ, \theta).$$

So $C_q(\mathcal{L}, \theta) \neq 0$ implies $0 \leq q - j \leq \dim N$ or $m^-(\mathcal{L}, \theta) \leq q \leq m^-(\mathcal{L}, \theta) + m^0(\mathcal{L}, \theta)$.

Proof. The second claim may follow the first one and a theorem due to Palais (cf. [4, p.14]). We shall follow the ideas of proof in [5, Th.5.1.17] to prove the first claim. We can assume $\mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0$. Note that $H^- \subset X$ implies

$$X^- := X \cap H^- = P^-(X), \quad X^+ := X \cap H^+ = P^+(X)$$

and topological direct sum decomposition $X = N \oplus X^- \oplus X^+$. Since φ is an origin-preserving local homeomorphism defined on B_δ^X we can assume that $\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X}$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{L}|_{W \cap X}(x) = f_1(x^\perp) + \mathcal{L}(h(z) + z) \ \forall x \in B_\delta^X,$$

where $z = P(x) \in N$, $x^\perp = x^+ + x^- = P^+x + P^-x \in X^+ \oplus X^-$ and

$$f_1(x^\perp) = \frac{1}{2}(B(\theta)x^\perp, x^\perp) = \frac{1}{2}(B(\theta)x^+, x^+) + \frac{1}{2}(B(\theta)x^-, x^-).$$

Since $\dim N < \infty$, one can construct a function f_2 on N satisfying the (PS) condition and such that $f_2(z) = \mathcal{L}(h(z) + z)$ for all z in a neighborhood of θ in N .

Let $X_1 = X^\perp$ and $X_2 = N$. Take an isolated neighborhood U_i of θ_i for f_i in X_i , $i = 1, 2$. We can assume that $U_i \subset f_i^{-1}[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $i = 1, 2$. Let $\eta(s) = \eta(s, u)$ be the flow defined by the equation (8) in [8], i.e.,

$$\dot{\eta}(s) = -\frac{B(\theta)\eta(s)}{\|B(\theta)\eta(s)\|}, \quad \eta(0) = u,$$

on $X^\perp \setminus \{\theta\}$. Denote by $\tilde{U}_i$ the smallest η -invariant set containing U_i , $i = 1, 2$. Then $W_i = \tilde{U}_i \cap f_i^{-1}[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ is also an isolated neighborhood of θ_i for f_i , $i = 1, 2$. Take a strong deformation retract ψ deforming $(f_2)_\epsilon$ to $(f_2)_0$, and define a deformation

$$\phi(x^\perp, z, t) = x^\perp + (1-t)x^\perp + \psi(z, t).$$

One can get the desired result as in the proof of [5, Th.5.1.17]. $\square$

Corresponding to the above theory one can get the corresponding generalization of the theory in [4, Section 7.3]. Instead of this we shall show that Theorem 1.1 is sufficient in the present case; see Section 3.

2 Modified variational setup

For integers $m \geq 3$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a compact C^m -smooth manifold M without boundary and C^{m-1} -smooth $L : \mathbb{R} \times TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the assumptions (L1)-(L3) in [12, Section 1], the functional

$$\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(\gamma) = \int_0^{k\tau} L(t, \gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) dt$$

on the C^{m-1} -smooth Hilbert manifold $E_{k\tau} = W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, M)$, where $S_{k\tau} := \mathbb{R}/k\tau\mathbb{Z} = \{[s]_{k\tau} \mid [s]_{k\tau} = s + k\tau\mathbb{Z}, s \in \mathbb{R}\}$, is C^{2-0} -smooth, bounded below, and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition (cf. [2, Prop.2.2]). By [7, Th.3.7.2], all critical points of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ are all of class C^{m-1} and therefore correspond to all $k\tau$ -periodic solutions of the Lagrangian system on M :

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i} = 0$$

in any local coordinates $(q_1, \dots, q_n)$. In the following we shall show that the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ satisfies the setting in Section 1 and give the revision of [12, Section 3].

Firstly, by the condition (L2) and [6, pp.175], the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ is C^2 -smooth on the C^2 -Banach manifold

$$X_{k\tau} := C^1(S_{k\tau}, M)$$

with the usual topology of uniform convergence of the curves and their derivatives. So $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ has the same critical point set on $E_{k\tau}$ and $X_{k\tau}$. Denote by $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau} = \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}|_{X_{k\tau}}$. The second-order differential $d^2\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\gamma_0)$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at a critical point $\gamma_0 \in X_{k\tau}$ is an invariantly defined symmetric bilinear form on $T_{\gamma_0}X_{k\tau} = C^1(\gamma_0^*TM)$. Let

$$\bar{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0) \quad (\text{resp.} \quad \bar{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0)) \quad (2.1)$$

denote the maximal value of dimensions of linear subspaces $L \subset T_{\gamma_0} X_{k\tau}$ on which $d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\gamma_0) < 0$ (resp. $d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\gamma_0) = 0$). Then the assumptions (L1)-(L3) implies that both $\bar{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0)$ and $\bar{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0)$ are finite as showed below. We roughly call them the **Morse index** and **nullity** of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at γ_0 because they paly the same roles.

By the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [12], near a critical point γ_0 (which is C^2 -smooth due to our assumptions) we can pullback L to $\tilde{L} : \mathbb{R} \times B_\rho^n(0) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ by [12, (3.15)]. Let $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ (or $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$) be the pullback of $\gamma \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, M)$ (or $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, M)$) near γ_0 by the coordinate chart $\phi_{k\tau}$ as in [12, (3.8)]. Then $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = 0$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha}) &= \int_0^{k\tau} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\alpha}(t), \dot{\tilde{\alpha}}(t)) dt \quad \forall \tilde{\alpha} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0)), \\ \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha}) &= \int_0^{k\tau} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\alpha}(t), \dot{\tilde{\alpha}}(t)) dt \quad \forall \tilde{\alpha} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0)).\end{aligned}$$

Then $0 \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ is the critical point of both. By [12, (3.10)],

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau} = \mathcal{L}_{k\tau} \circ \phi_{k\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau} \circ \phi_{k\tau} \quad (2.2)$$

In the following we shall prove that the functional $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$, $X = C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $H = W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $W = W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.1.

Recall that

$$d\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}) = \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) + D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \right) dt$$

for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$, $\tilde{\xi} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and that

$$\begin{aligned}d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) &= \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) (\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t), \dot{\tilde{\eta}}(t)) \right. \\ &\quad + D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) (\tilde{\xi}(t), \dot{\tilde{\eta}}(t)) \\ &\quad + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) (\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t), \tilde{\eta}(t)) \\ &\quad \left. + D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) (\tilde{\xi}(t), \tilde{\eta}(t)) \right) dt \quad (2.3)\end{aligned}$$

for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$, $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (2.2), it is clear that

$$\bar{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0) = m^-(d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0)) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0) = m^0(d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0)), \quad (2.4)$$

where $m^-(d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0))$ (resp. $m^0(d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0))$) is the maximal value of dimensions of linear subspaces $L \subset C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ on which $d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0) < 0$ (resp. $d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0) = 0$).

Let $\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the gradient of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at $\tilde{\gamma} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$. If $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$d\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}) = d\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}) = (\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}), \tilde{\xi})_{W^{1,2}}.$$

We need to compute $\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ let us define

$$G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) = \int_0^s \left[D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) - \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) dt \right] dt. \quad (2.5)$$

Then $G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a $k\tau$ -periodic primitive function of the function

$$s \mapsto D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) - \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) ds$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{k\tau} D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^{k\tau} \left[D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) - \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) dt \right] \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}), \tilde{\xi})_{W^{1,2}} \\ &= \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) + D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \right) dt \\ &= \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) - G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(t) \right) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) dt + (G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}), \xi)_{W^{1,2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Lemma 2.1 *If $f \in L^1(S_T, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is bounded, then the equation*

$$x''(t) - x(t) = f(t)$$

has an unique T -periodic solution

$$x(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{t-s} f(s) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{s-t} f(s) ds.$$

Since

$$\tilde{\xi} \mapsto \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) - G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(t) \right) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) dt$$

is a bounded linear functional on $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, the Riesz theorem yields an unique $F(\tilde{\gamma}) \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) - G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(t) \right) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) dt = (F(\tilde{\gamma}), \tilde{\xi})_{W^{1,2}} \tag{2.7}$$

for any $\tilde{\xi} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. It follows from this and (2.6) that

$$\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) = G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) + F(\tilde{\gamma}). \tag{2.8}$$

By Lemma 2.1, (2.7) and a direct computation we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(\tilde{\gamma})(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds \\ &+ \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This and (2.8) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds \\
&+ \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds + G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(t), \\
\frac{d}{dt} \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) D_{\tilde{q}} - \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds \\
&- \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds \\
&+ D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) - \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} D_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where $G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is given by (2.5). It follows that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) &\implies \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and} \\ C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0)) \ni \tilde{\gamma} &\mapsto \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \text{ is continuous.} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.9)$$

Define $A_{k\tau} : C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0)) \rightarrow C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ by $A_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) = \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})$.

Lemma 2.2 $A_{k\tau}$ is continuously differentiable.

Proof. For $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, a direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(t) &= \int_0^t \left[D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) - \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \right) ds \right] ds, \\
\frac{d}{dt} G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(t) &= D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, \tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) - \\
&\quad \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{L}$ is C^2 , it follows that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta = \delta(\tilde{\gamma}) > 0$ such that

$$\|(G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{h}) - G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}))(\tilde{\xi})\|_{C^1} \leq \varepsilon \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{C^1}$$

for any $\tilde{h} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ with $\|\tilde{h}\|_{C^1} < \delta$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Namely

$$C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0)) \ni \tilde{\gamma} \mapsto G_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \text{ is } C^1\text{-smooth.}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \right) ds \\
&+ \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \right) ds + G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(t), \\
\frac{d}{dt}A'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \right) ds \\
&- \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(s) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \right) ds + \frac{d}{dt}G'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi})(t).
\end{aligned}$$

From them it easily follows that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta = \delta(\tilde{\gamma}) > 0$ such that

$$\|(A'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{h}) - A'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}))(\tilde{\xi})\|_{C^1} \leq \varepsilon \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{C^1}$$

for any $\tilde{h} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ with $\|\tilde{h}\|_{C^1} < \delta$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and thus

$$\|A'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{h}) - A'_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})\|_{C^1} \leq \varepsilon \|\tilde{\xi}\|$$

for any $\tilde{h} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ with $\|\tilde{h}\|_{C^1} < \delta$. This proves that $A_{k\tau}$ is C^1 . $\square$

In summary, the functional $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ satisfies the condition (FN2) in Section 1 for $X = C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $W = W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $A = \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}|_{W \cap X}$.

Remark 2.3 For $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_\tau, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^k \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(G_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds \\
&+ \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(G_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})(s) - D_{\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(s)) \right) ds + G_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})(t),
\end{aligned}$$

which is also τ -periodic.

By (2.3) it is easily checked:

(i) For any $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ there exists a constant $C(\tilde{\gamma})$ such that

$$|d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})| \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}) \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{W^{1,2}} \cdot \|\tilde{\eta}\|_{W^{1,2}} \quad \forall \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n);$$

(ii) $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists \delta > 0$, such that for any $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ with $\|\tilde{\gamma}_1 - \tilde{\gamma}_2\|_{C^1} < \delta$ the following holds:

$$|d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}_1)(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) - d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}_2)(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})| \leq \varepsilon \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{W^{1,2}} \cdot \|\tilde{\eta}\|_{W^{1,2}} \quad \forall \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Hence by [8, Prop.2.1] there exists a continuous map

$$B_{k\tau} : C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0)) \rightarrow L(W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n), W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n))$$

such that for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$d^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) = (B_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}) \cdot \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})_{W^{1,2}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Since the right side of (2.3) can be extended into a bounded symmetric bilinear form on $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $B_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}(t) &= D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0), \quad \hat{Q}(t) = D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0), \quad \hat{R}(t) = D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0), \\ \hat{L}(t, \tilde{y}, \tilde{v}) &= \frac{1}{2} \hat{P}(t) \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{v} + \hat{Q}(t) \tilde{y} \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{R}(t) \tilde{y} \cdot \tilde{y} \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{f}_{k\tau}(\tilde{y}) &= \int_0^{k\tau} \hat{L}(t, \tilde{y}(t), \dot{\tilde{y}}(t)) dt \quad \forall \tilde{y} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\hat{f}_{k\tau}$ is C^2 -smooth on $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\tilde{y} = 0 \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a critical point of $\hat{f}_{k\tau}$. It is also easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 \hat{f}_{k\tau}(0)(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) &= \int_0^{k\tau} \left[(\hat{P} \dot{\tilde{\xi}} + \hat{Q} \dot{\tilde{\xi}}) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\eta}} + \hat{Q}^T \dot{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \tilde{\eta} + \hat{R} \tilde{\xi} \cdot \tilde{\eta} \right] dt \\ &= \int_0^{k\tau} \left(D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0) (\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t), \dot{\tilde{\eta}}(t)) + D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0) (\tilde{\xi}(t), \dot{\tilde{\eta}}(t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0) (\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t), \tilde{\eta}(t)) + D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}} \tilde{L}(t, 0, 0) (\tilde{\xi}(t), \tilde{\eta}(t)) \right) dt \\ &= (B_{k\tau}(0) \cdot \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})_{W^{1,2}} \quad \forall \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Lemma 2.4 $B_{k\tau}(0)$ satisfies the conditions (CP1)-(CP2).

Proof. Firstly, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that there exists a linear symmetric compact operator $Q_{k\tau} : W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\int_0^{k\tau} \tilde{\xi}(t) \cdot \tilde{\eta}(t) dt = (Q_{k\tau} \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})_{W^{1,2}} \quad \forall \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Note that for sufficiently large $M > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$M \int_0^{k\tau} \tilde{\xi}(t) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(t) dt + d^2 \hat{f}_{k\tau}(0)(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}) \geq \delta \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 \quad \forall \tilde{\xi} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Hence $A_{k\tau} := MQ_{k\tau} + B_{k\tau}(0) : W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a bounded linear symmetric positive definite operator. Since $C_{k\tau} := M(A_{k\tau})^{-1}Q_{k\tau}$ is compact,

$$B_{k\tau}(0) = A_{k\tau} - MQ_{k\tau} = A_{k\tau}(I - C_{k\tau}) \quad \text{implies}$$

- a) 0 is an isolated spectrum point of $B_{k\tau}(0)$,
- b) the maximal negative subspace of $B_{k\tau}(0)$ in $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is finitely dimensional and is contained in $C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. (See the arguments in [6, p.176-177]).

Next, we prove the regularity of $B_{k\tau}(0)$. That is, if $\tilde{\xi} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is such that $B_{k\tau}(0)\tilde{\xi} = \tilde{\zeta} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, then $\tilde{\xi} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. To this goal let

$$J_{k\tau}(s) = \int_0^s \left[(\hat{P}(t)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{\xi}(t)) - \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} (\hat{P}(t)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{\xi}(t)) dt \right] dt$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\dot{J}_{k\tau}(t) = (\hat{P}(t)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{\xi}(t)) - \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} (\hat{P}(t)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{\xi}(t)) dt,$$

and using the integration by parts we get

$$\int_0^{k\tau} (\hat{P}\dot{\tilde{\xi}} + \hat{Q}\tilde{\xi}) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\eta}} dt = \int_0^{k\tau} \dot{J}_{k\tau} \cdot \tilde{\eta} dt$$

for any $\tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, (2.11) gives

$$\int_0^{k\tau} \left[(\hat{P}\dot{\tilde{\xi}} + \hat{Q}\tilde{\xi}) \cdot \dot{\tilde{\eta}} + \hat{Q}^T \dot{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \tilde{\eta} + \hat{R}\tilde{\xi} \cdot \tilde{\eta} \right] dt = (\tilde{\zeta}, \tilde{\eta})_{W^{1,2}}$$

for any $\tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence we have

$$\int_0^{k\tau} \left[(\hat{Q}^T \dot{\tilde{\xi}} + \hat{R}\tilde{\xi} - J_{k\tau}) \cdot \tilde{\eta} \right] dt = (\tilde{\zeta} - J_{k\tau}, \tilde{\eta})_{W^{1,2}}.$$

for any $\tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. As in the arguments below (2.8) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\zeta}(t) - J_{k\tau}(t) &= \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(J_{k\tau}(s) - \hat{Q}^T(s)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) - \hat{R}(s)\tilde{\xi}(s) \right) ds \\ &+ \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(J_{k\tau}(s) - \hat{Q}^T(s)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) - \hat{R}(s)\tilde{\xi}(s) \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{J}_{k\tau}(t) &= \dot{\tilde{\zeta}}(t) - \frac{e^t}{2} \int_t^\infty e^{-s} \left(J_{k\tau}(s) - \hat{Q}^T(s)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) - \hat{R}(s)\tilde{\xi}(s) \right) ds \\ &+ \frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^s \left(J_{k\tau}(s) - \hat{Q}^T(s)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(s) - \hat{R}(s)\tilde{\xi}(s) \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

is continuous in $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\hat{P}(t)$ is invertible and

$$\hat{P}(t)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{\xi}(t) = \dot{J}_{k\tau}(t) + \frac{1}{k\tau} \int_0^{k\tau} (\hat{P}(t)\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t) + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{\xi}(t)) dt.$$

Hence $\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t)$ is continuous in t , i.e. $\tilde{\xi} \in C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Lemma 2.4 is proved. $\square$

The condition (CP2) implies $\text{Ker}(B_{k\tau}(0)) \subset C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. This and b) yield

$$\left. \begin{aligned} m^-(d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0)) &= m_{k\tau}^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0) = m_{k\tau}^-(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) \quad \text{and} \\ m^0(d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(0)) &= m_{k\tau}^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0) = m_{k\tau}^0(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.12)$$

where $m_{k\tau}^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0)$ and $m_{k\tau}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0)$ are the **Morse index** and **nullity** of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at $0 \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ as defined in Definition 1.3, i.e., $m_{k\tau}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0) = \dim \text{Ker}(B_{k\tau}(0))$ and $m_{k\tau}^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0)$ is the dimension of the maximal negative subspace of $B_{k\tau}(0)$ in $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. It follows from (2.4) and (2.12) that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) = m_{k\tau}^-(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) = m_{k\tau}^0(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) \leq 2n. \quad (2.13)$$

Let $\Psi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ be the fundamental solution of the problem $\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = J_0 \hat{S}(t) \mathbf{u}$ with $\Psi(0) = I_{2n}$. Here

$$\hat{S}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{P}(t)^{-1} & -\hat{P}(t)^{-1} \hat{Q}(t) \\ -\hat{Q}(t)^T \hat{P}(t)^{-1} & \hat{Q}(t)^T \hat{P}(t)^{-1} \hat{Q}(t) - \hat{R}(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By [12, (2.16)], for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$m_{k\tau}^-(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) = i_{k\tau}(\Psi) \quad \text{and} \quad m_{k\tau}^0(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) = \nu_{k\tau}(\Psi)$$

From this and [12, Lemma 2.1] we get the following revision of Theorem 3.1 in [12].

Theorem 2.5 *For a critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on E_τ , assume that $\gamma^* TM \rightarrow S_\tau$ is trivial. Then the mean Morse index*

$$\hat{\overline{m}}_\tau^-(\gamma) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma^k)}{k} \quad (2.14)$$

always exists, and it holds that

$$\max \left\{ 0, k \hat{\overline{m}}_\tau^-(\gamma) - n \right\} \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma^k) \leq k \hat{\overline{m}}_\tau^-(\gamma) + n - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma^k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.15)$$

Consequently, for any critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on E_τ , $\hat{\overline{m}}_{2\tau}^-(\gamma^2)$ exists and

$$\max \left\{ 0, k \hat{\overline{m}}_{2\tau}^-(\gamma^2) - n \right\} \leq \overline{m}_{2k\tau}^-(\gamma^{2k}) \leq k \hat{\overline{m}}_{2\tau}^-(\gamma) + n - \overline{m}_{2k\tau}^0(\gamma^{2k}) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (2.16)$$

because $(\gamma^2)^ TM \rightarrow S_{2\tau}$ is always trivial.*

Similarly, for a critical point γ_0 of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E$ on $EH_{k\tau}$ let

$$\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma_0) \quad (\text{resp.} \quad \overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^0(\gamma_0)) \quad (2.17)$$

denote the maximal value of dimensions of linear subspaces $S \subset T_{\gamma_0} EX_{k\tau}$ on which $d^2 \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E(\gamma_0) < 0$ (resp. $d^2 \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E(\gamma_0) = 0$). Here

$$EX_{k\tau} = \{ \gamma \in X_{k\tau} \mid \gamma(-t) = \gamma(t) \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \}$$

and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E$ to $EX_{k\tau}$. Then $0 \leq \overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^0(\gamma_0) \leq 2n$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The following is our revision of Theorem 3.3 in [12].

Theorem 2.6 *Let L satisfy the conditions (L1)-(L4). Then for any critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau^E$ on EH_τ , the mean Morse index*

$$\hat{\overline{m}}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma^k)}{k} \quad (2.18)$$

exists, and it holds that

$$\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma^k) + \overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^0(\gamma^k) \leq n \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{if} \quad \hat{\overline{m}}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma) = 0. \quad (2.19)$$

3 Critical modules under iteration maps

This section is the revision of [12, Section 4]. The passage from the line 8 of [12, p. 2991] to the end of proof of [12, Lemma 4.2] is not needed in the following arguments. Here is the revised version of Theorem 4.4 in [12].

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\gamma_0 \in H_\tau(\alpha)$ be an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha)$ such that $\gamma_0^* TM \rightarrow S_\tau$ is trivial. Suppose that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the iteration γ_0^k is also an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$, and*

$$\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0). \quad (3.1)$$

For $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma_0)$ and any small $\varepsilon > 0$, suppose that

$$(W_\tau, W_\tau^-) =: (W(\gamma_0), W(\gamma_0)^-) \quad \text{and} \quad (W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-) =: (W(\gamma_0^k), W(\gamma_0^k)^-)$$

are the topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\gamma_0 \in H_\tau(\alpha)$ and of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at $\gamma_0^k \in H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$, defined by [12, (4.6)]. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (W_\tau, W_\tau^-) &\subset ((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}[c - \varepsilon, c + \varepsilon], (\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c - \varepsilon)), \\ (W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-) &\subset ((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}[kc - k\varepsilon, kc + k\varepsilon], (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc - k\varepsilon)), \\ (\psi^k(W_\tau), \psi^k(W_\tau^-)) &\subset (W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and the homomorphism

$$(\psi^k)_* : H_*(W_\tau, W_\tau^-; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-; \mathbb{K}) \quad (3.3)$$

is an isomorphism. (Hereafter $\mathbb{K}$ is always assumed to be a field without special statements.) Specially, $(\psi^1)_* = \text{id}$, and $(\psi^k)_* \circ (\psi^l)_* = (\psi^{kl})_*$ if the iterations γ_0^l and γ_0^{kl} are also isolated, and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \overline{m}_{kl\tau}^-(\gamma_0^{kl}) &= \overline{m}_{l\tau}^-(\gamma_0^l) = \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0), \\ \overline{m}_{kl\tau}^0(\gamma_0^{kl}) &= \overline{m}_{l\tau}^0(\gamma_0^l) = \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0) \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Follow the notations in [12], but γ_0 in the charts defined by [12, (3.6), (3.7)] is chosen as the present γ_0 .

Step 1. Let $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = (\phi_\tau)^{-1}(\gamma_0)$. Then $\tilde{\gamma}_0^j = (\phi_{j\tau})^{-1}(\gamma_0^j) = 0$ is isolated critical points of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau} = \mathcal{L}_{j\tau} \circ \phi_{j\tau}$ in $W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By (3.1) and (2.12) one has

$$\left. \begin{aligned} m^-(d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}(0)) &= m_{j\tau}^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}, 0) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau(0) = m_\tau^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0), \\ m^0(d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}(0)) &= m_{j\tau}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}, 0) = m^0(d^2 \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau(0)) = m_\tau^0(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.5)$$

for $j = k, l, kl$. Let $(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)^-)$ and $(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k)^-)$ be the Gromoll-Meyer pairs defined above [12, (4.5)] (with $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_0$). By [12, (4.6)] the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)^-) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}^k} & (\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k)^-) \\ \phi_\tau \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi_{k\tau} \\ (W(\gamma_0), W(\gamma_0)^-) & \xrightarrow{\psi^k} & (W(\gamma_0^k), W(\gamma_0^k)^-) \end{array}$$

commutes. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_\tau)_* : H_*(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)^-; \mathbb{K}) &\rightarrow H_*(W(\gamma_0), W(\gamma_0)^-; \mathbb{K}) \quad \text{and} \\ (\phi_{k\tau})_* : H_*(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k)^-; \mathbb{K}) &\rightarrow H_*(W(\gamma_0^k), W(\gamma_0^k)^-; \mathbb{K}) \end{aligned}$$

are isomorphisms. The question is equivalent to

Claim 3.2 *The map $\tilde{\psi}^k$ induces an isomorphism*

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : H_*(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)^-; \mathbb{K}) \longrightarrow H_*(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k)^-; \mathbb{K}).$$

Step 2. Recall that the Gromoll-Meyer pairs $(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)^-)$ and $(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k)^-)$ above [12, (4.5)] (with $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_0$) are with respect to the negative gradient vector fields $-\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau$ and $-\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$, respectively. Let $\eta^{(j)}$ be the flows of $-\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}$, $j = 1, k$. Since

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})) = \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{\gamma})) \quad \forall \tilde{\gamma} \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, B_\rho^n(0)) \quad (3.6)$$

we have

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(\eta^{(1)}(t, \tilde{\gamma})) = \eta^{(k)}(t, \tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{\gamma})) \quad \forall \tilde{\gamma} \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, B_\rho^n(0)). \quad (3.7)$$

Recall the proof of [4, Th.5.2]. For $j = 1, k$ let

$$U_+^{(j)} = \cup_{0 < t < \infty} \eta^{(j)}(t, \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^j)), \quad \tilde{U}_+^{(j)} = \cup_{0 < t < \infty} \eta^{(j)}(t, \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^j)^-)$$

and $\mathfrak{F}_j$ be the continuous functions on $\tilde{U}_+^{(j)}$ defined by the condition:

$$\eta^{(j)}(\mathfrak{F}_j(x), x) \in (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc-j\varepsilon} \cap \tilde{U}_+^{(j)}, \quad \text{but} \quad \eta^{(j)}(t, x) \notin (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc-j\varepsilon} \cap \tilde{U}_+^{(j)} \quad \text{if } t < \mathfrak{F}_j(x).$$

By (3.7), it is not hard to check that

$$\mathfrak{F}_k(\tilde{\psi}^k(x)) = \mathfrak{F}_1(x) \quad \forall x \in \tilde{U}_+^{(1)}.$$

Hence for $j = 1, k$, the strong deformation retracts

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(j)} : \tilde{U}_+^{(j)} \times [0, 1] &\rightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc-j\varepsilon} \cap \tilde{U}_+^{(j)} = (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc-j\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(j)}, \\ (x, t) &\mapsto \eta^{(j)}(\mathfrak{F}_j(x), x) \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

satisfy

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(\sigma^{(1)}(t, x)) = \sigma^{(k)}(t, \tilde{\psi}^k(x)) \quad \forall (x, t) \in \tilde{U}_+^{(1)} \times [0, 1].$$

These show that the map

$$\sigma_1^{(j)} : \tilde{U}_+^{(j)} \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc-j\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(j)}, \quad x \mapsto \sigma^{(j)}(1, x)$$

induces the isomorphism

$$(\sigma_1^{(j)})_* : H_*(U_+^{(j)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(j)}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc+j\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(j)}, (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc-j\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(j)}; \mathbb{K})$$

for $j = 1, k$, and that the following commutative diagram holds:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_{c+\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(1)}, (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_{c-\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{(\sigma_1^{(1)})_*} & H_*(U_+^{(1)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \\
(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \downarrow & & \downarrow (\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \\
H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc+k\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(k)}, (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc-k\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{(\sigma_1^{(k)})_*} & H_*(U_+^{(k)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}).
\end{array} \tag{3.9}$$

For $\delta > 0$ let

$$\tilde{U}_\delta^{(j)} = \cup_{0 < t < \infty} \eta^{(j)}(t, \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^j)^-), \quad j = 1, k.$$

Then $\tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}) \subset \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}$ and

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(U_+^{(1)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}) \subset U_+^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}, \quad \tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{U}_+^{(1)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}) \subset \tilde{U}_+^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}.$$

From these and the excision property we get the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_*(U_+^{(1)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(1)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{isomorphism}} & H_*(U_+^{(1)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \\
(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \downarrow & & \downarrow (\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \\
H_*(U_+^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{isomorphism}} & H_*(U_+^{(k)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}),
\end{array} \tag{3.10}$$

where two isomorphisms are induced by the inclusions. Since the reversed flows

$$\eta^{(j)}(-t) : (U_+^{(j)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(j)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(j)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(j)}) \rightarrow (\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^j), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^j)^-), \quad j = 1, k,$$

are also strong deformation retracts, as in (3.9) we get the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_*(U_+^{(1)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(1)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{isomorphism}} & H_*(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)^-; \mathbb{K}) \\
(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \downarrow & & \downarrow (\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \\
H_*(U_+^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}, \tilde{U}_+^{(k)} \setminus \tilde{U}_\delta^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{isomorphism}} & H_*(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}_0^k)^-; \mathbb{K}).
\end{array} \tag{3.11}$$

Finally, by the Deformation Theorem 3.2 in [4] (with the flows of $-\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau} / \|\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}\|_{j\tau}^2$, $j = 1, k$) we have also the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_{c+\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(1)}, (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_{c-\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{isom}} & H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap U_+^{(1)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \setminus \{0\}) \cap U_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \\
(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \downarrow & & \downarrow (\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \\
H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc+k\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(k)}, (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc-k\varepsilon} \cap U_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{isom}} & H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap U_+^{(k)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}).
\end{array}$$

This and the commutative diagrams (3.9)-(3.11) show that Claim 3.2 is equivalent to

Claim 3.3 *The map $\tilde{\psi}^k$ induces an isomorphism*

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap U_+^{(1)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \setminus \{0\}) \cap U_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap U_+^{(k)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}).$$

Using the excision property it is easily proved that Claim 3.3 is equivalent to

Claim 3.4 *There exist small open neighborhoods $U^{(1)}$ of $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = 0 \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $U^{(k)}$ of $\tilde{\gamma}_0^k = 0 \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$ with*

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(U^{(1)}) \subset U^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(j)} \subset U_+^{(j)}, \quad j = 1, k, \quad (3.12)$$

such that

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap U^{(1)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap U^{(k)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(k)}; \mathbb{K})$$

is an isomorphism.

Step 3. Since $\tilde{\psi}^j(C^1(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)) \subset C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, by Palais theorem (cf. [4, p.14, Cor.1.1]), the inclusion

$$I_j : ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \cap U^{(j)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(j)}) \hookrightarrow ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \cap U^{(j)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(j)})$$

is the homotopy equivalence, where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}$ is the restriction of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau$ to $C^1(S_{j\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$, $j = 1, k$. Note that $\tilde{\psi}^k \circ I_1 = I_k \circ \tilde{\psi}^k$. Claim 3.4 is equivalent to

Claim 3.5 *There exist small open neighborhoods $U^{(j)}$ of $\tilde{\gamma}_0^j = 0 \in W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$, $j = 1, k$, satisfying (3.12), such that $\tilde{\psi}^k$ induces an isomorphism*

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap U^{(1)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap U^{(k)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}).$$

Note that the inclusion $C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is continuous. For any open neighborhoods $U^{(j)}$ of $\tilde{\gamma}_0^j = 0 \in W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, B_\rho^n(0))$, $j = 1, k$, satisfying (3.12), since the sets $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \cap U^{(j)}$ and $((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U^{(j)}$ are also open in $C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ (as inverse images of open subsets in $W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$) for $j = 1, k$, we can always take an open neighborhood $V^{(j)}$ of $0 \in C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, k$, such that

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(V^{(1)}) \subset V^{(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \cap V^{(j)} \subset (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau})_{jc} \cap U^{(j)}, \quad j = 1, k. \quad (3.13)$$

By the excision property of homology groups, Claim 3.5 is equivalent to

Claim 3.6 *There exists an open neighborhood $V^{(j)}$ of $0 \in C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, k$, satisfying (3.13), such that $\tilde{\psi}^k$ induces an isomorphism*

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap V^{(1)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \setminus \{0\}) \cap V^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap V^{(k)}, ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap V^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}).$$

Step 4. Let $B_{j\tau}(0)$ be as in (2.10). We have the orthogonal decompositions

$$W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) = N_{j\tau}^0 \oplus N_{j\tau}^- \oplus N_{j\tau}^+ = N_{j\tau}^0 \oplus N_{j\tau}^\perp, \quad j = 1, k,$$

where $N_{j\tau}^*$, $*$ = 0, −, +, are the null, negative, and positive definite spaces of $B_{j\tau}(0)$, respectively, $j = 1, k$. Note that $N_{j\tau}^0$ and $N_{j\tau}^-$ are contained in $C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. So we have also topological direct sum decompositions

$$C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) = N_{j\tau}^0 \oplus N_{j\tau}^- \oplus X_{j\tau}^+, \quad X_{j\tau}^+ = N_{j\tau}^+ \cap C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n), \quad j = 1, k.$$

By Theorem 1.1 there exist an open neighborhood $\widehat{U}_{j\tau}$ of 0 in $C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, an origin-preserving local homeomorphism $\widehat{\Theta}_{j\tau}$ defined on $\widehat{U}_{j\tau}$ and a C^1 map

$$h_{j\tau} : \widehat{U}_{j\tau} \cap N_{j\tau}^0 \rightarrow N_{j\tau}^- \oplus X_{j\tau}^+$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau} \circ \widehat{\Theta}_{j\tau}(x^0 + x^- + x^+) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[(B_{j\tau}(0)x^-, x^-) + (B_{j\tau}(0)x^+, x^+)] + \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}(h_{j\tau}(x^0) + x^0) \\ &\equiv \widehat{\beta}_{j\tau}(x^- + x^+) + \widehat{\alpha}_{j\tau}(x^0) \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

for any $x^0 + x^- + x^+ \in \widehat{U}_{j\tau} \cap (N_{j\tau}^0 \oplus N_{j\tau}^- \oplus X_{j\tau}^+)$, $j = 1, k$. (**Note:** $\widehat{\beta}_{j\tau}$ is C^∞ and $\widehat{\alpha}_{j\tau}$ is C^1 , $j = 1, k$). By Remark 2.3 and (2.10) it is easy to see that

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(A_\tau(x)) = A_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}^k(B_\tau(x)\xi) = B_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x))\tilde{\psi}^k(\xi) \quad (3.15)$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in C^1(S_\tau, B_\rho^n(0))$ and $\xi \in C^1(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, (3.1) and (3.5) imply that for $*$ = 0, −,

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(N_\tau^*) = N_{k\tau}^*, \quad \tilde{\psi}^k(N_\tau^+) = N_{k\tau}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}^k(X_\tau^+) = X_{k\tau}^+ \quad (3.16)$$

From this, (3.14) and (3.15) we get

$$\widehat{\beta}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(y)) = k\widehat{\beta}_\tau(y) \quad \forall y \in N_\tau^- \oplus X_\tau^+. \quad (3.17)$$

As in the proofs of [11, Lem. 3.2, 3.3] we can get

Lemma 3.7 *The iteration maps $\tilde{\psi}^k : X_\tau^+ \rightarrow X_{k\tau}^+$ and $\tilde{\psi}^k : N_\tau^* \rightarrow N_{k\tau}^*$ for $*$ = 0, − are linear, continuous and injective. If $\overline{m}_{k\tau}(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau(\gamma_0)$, the map $\tilde{\psi}^k : N_\tau^- \rightarrow N_{k\tau}^-$ is a linear diffeomorphism. If $\overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0)$, then the map $\tilde{\psi}^k : N_\tau^0 \rightarrow N_{k\tau}^0$ is a linear diffeomorphism, and the neighborhood $\widehat{U}_{j\tau}$ of $0 \in C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, the origin-preserving homeomorphism $\widehat{\Theta}_{j\tau}$ defined on $\widehat{U}_{j\tau}$ and map $h_{j\tau} \in C^1(\widehat{U}_{j\tau} \cap N_{j\tau}^0, N_{j\tau}^- \oplus X_{j\tau}^+)$, $j = 1, k$, are chosen to satisfy:*

$$\widehat{U}_{k\tau} \cap \tilde{\psi}^k(C^1(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)) = \tilde{\psi}^k(\widehat{U}_\tau), \quad (3.18)$$

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{k\tau} \circ \tilde{\psi}^k = \tilde{\psi}^k \circ \widehat{\Theta}_\tau : \widehat{U}_\tau \rightarrow C^1(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n), \quad (3.19)$$

$$\widehat{\alpha}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x)) = k\widehat{\alpha}_\tau(x) \quad \forall x \in \widehat{U}_\tau \cap N_\tau^0. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. For the sake of clearness we give a detailed proof. For small $\delta > 0$ let

$$B_\delta^{(j\tau)} := \{x \in C^1(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \|x\|_{C^1} < \delta\}, \quad j = 1, k.$$

Then $\tilde{\psi}^k(B_\delta^{(\tau)}) \subset B_\delta^{(k\tau)}$. By the proof of Step 1 in [8, Section 3], if $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, then for each $x^0 \in N_{j\tau}^0 \cap B_\delta^{(j\tau)}$, $h_{j\tau}(x^0) \in X_{j\tau}^\perp$ is the unique solution of the equation

$$P_{j\tau}^\perp A_{j\tau}(x^0 + h_{j\tau}(x^0)) = 0,$$

where $P_{j\tau}^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection from $W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to $N_{j\tau}^\perp$, $j = 1, k$. Suppose that $P_\tau^\perp A_\tau(x^0 + h_\tau(x^0)) = 0$ for $x^0 \in N_\tau^0 \cap B_\delta^{(\tau)}$. By $\tilde{\psi}^k \circ P_\tau^\perp = P_{k\tau}^\perp \circ \tilde{\psi}^k$ and the first identity in (3.15) we get $P_{k\tau}^\perp A_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^0) + \tilde{\psi}^k(h_\tau(x^0))) = 0$. This implies that

$$h_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^0)) = \tilde{\psi}^k(h_\tau(x^0)) \quad \forall x^0 \in B_\delta^{(\tau)} \cap N_\tau^0. \quad (3.21)$$

As in [8, Section 3], for $j = 1, k$ let

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(j\tau)}(x^0, x^\perp) &= \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}(x^0 + h_{j\tau}(x^0) + x^\perp) - \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}(x^0 + h_{j\tau}(x^0)) \\ &\quad \forall (x^0, x^\perp) \in B_\delta^{(j\tau)} \cap N_{j\tau}^0 \times X_{j\tau}^\perp, \\ F_2^{(j\tau)}(x^\perp) &= \frac{1}{2}(B_{j\tau}(0)x^\perp, x^\perp)_{j\tau} \quad \forall x^\perp \in X_{j\tau}^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (3.21) and the second identity of (3.15) we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} F^{(k\tau)}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^0), \tilde{\psi}^k(x^\perp)) &= kF^{(\tau)}(x^0, x^\perp), \\ F_2^{(k\tau)}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^\perp)) &= kF_2^{(\tau)}(x^\perp) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.22)$$

for any $(x^0, x^\perp) \in B_\delta^{(\tau)} \cap N_\tau^0 \times X_\tau^\perp$.

Since $B_{j\tau} : N_{j\tau}^\perp \rightarrow N_{j\tau}^\perp$ is an isomorphism there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\|B_{j\tau}(0)x^\perp\|_{j\tau} \geq \lambda\|x^\perp\|_{j\tau} \quad \forall x^\perp \in X_{j\tau}^\perp, \quad j = 1, k.$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_{j\tau}$ is the norm induced by the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_{j\tau}$ on $W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, k$. Consider the flow $\zeta^{(j)}(s) = \zeta^{(j)}(s, x^\perp)$ defined by the following ODE:

$$\dot{\zeta}^{(j)}(s) = -\frac{B_{j\tau}(0)\zeta(s)}{\|B_{j\tau}(0)\zeta(s)\|_{j\tau}}, \quad \zeta(0) = x^\perp,$$

on $X_{j\tau}^\perp \setminus \{0\}$, $j = 1, k$. It follows from the second identity in (3.15) that

$$\tilde{\psi}^k(\zeta^{(1)}(t, x^\perp)) = \zeta^{(k)}(t, \tilde{\psi}^k(x^\perp)) \quad \forall x^\perp \in X_\tau^\perp \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.23)$$

By the proof of Step 3 in [8, Section 3], for any $0 < \epsilon < \lambda$ there exists $0 < \bar{\delta} \ll \delta$ such that for each $x^0 \in B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(j\tau)} \cap N_{j\tau}^0$ and $x^\perp \in B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(j\tau)} \cap X_{j\tau}^\perp \setminus \{0\}$ there exists a unique $\bar{t}_j(x^0, x^\perp)$ with

$$|\bar{t}_j(x^0, x^\perp)| \leq \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda}}\right)\|x^\perp\|_{j\tau}$$

such that

$$F_2^{(j\tau)}(\zeta^{(j)}(\bar{t}_j(x^0, x^\perp), x^\perp)) = F^{(j\tau)}(x^0, x^\perp), \quad j = 1, k.$$

Given $\bar{x}^0 \in B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(\tau)} \cap N_\tau^0$ and $\bar{x}^\perp \in B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(\tau)} \cap X_\tau^\perp \setminus \{0\}$, from (3.22)-(3.23) and

$$F_2^{(\tau)}(\zeta^{(1)}(\bar{t}_1(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp), \bar{x}^\perp)) = F^{(\tau)}(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp)$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{(k\tau)}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^0), \tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^\perp)) &= kF^{(\tau)}(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp) \\
&= kF_2^{(\tau)}(\zeta^{(1)}(\bar{t}_1(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp), \bar{x}^\perp)) \\
&= F_2^{(k\tau)}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\zeta^{(1)}(\bar{t}_1(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp), \bar{x}^\perp))) \\
&= F_2^{(k\tau)}(\zeta^{(k)}(\bar{t}_1(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp), \tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^\perp))).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $F_2^{(k\tau)}(\zeta^{(k)}(\bar{t}_k(\tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^0), \tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^\perp)), \tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^\perp))) = F^{(k\tau)}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^0), \tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^\perp))$. Hence the uniqueness implies

$$\bar{t}_1(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^\perp) = \bar{t}_k(\tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^0), \tilde{\psi}^k(\bar{x}^\perp)). \quad (3.24)$$

For $j = 1, k$, define $\xi^{(j)} : (B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(j\tau)} \cap N_{j\tau}^0) \times (B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(j\tau)} \cap X_{j\tau}^\perp) \rightarrow X_{j\tau}^\perp$ as follows:

$$\xi^{(j)}(x^0, x^\perp) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x^\perp = 0, \\ \zeta^{(j)}(\bar{t}_j(x^0, x^\perp), x^\perp) & \text{if } x^\perp \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

By (3.23)-(3.24) we get

$$\xi^{(k)}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^0), \tilde{\psi}^k(x^\perp)) = \tilde{\psi}^k(\xi^{(1)}(x^0, x^\perp))$$

for $x^0 \in B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(\tau)} \cap N_\tau^0$ and $x^\perp \in B_{\bar{\delta}}^{(\tau)} \cap X_\tau^\perp$. Then by Step 5 of the proof in [8, Section 3] the desired $\widehat{\Theta}_{j\tau}$ is the inverse of the map

$$(x^0, x^\perp) \mapsto (x^0, \xi^{(j)}(x^0, x^\perp - h_{j\tau}(x^0)))$$

and is defined on $B_{\bar{\delta}_0}^{(j)} \cap N_{j\tau}^0 \times B_{\bar{\delta}_0}^{(j)} \cap X_{j\tau}^\perp$ as well as on $B_{\bar{\delta}_0}^{(j)}$ for some small $0 < \bar{\delta}_0 < \bar{\delta}$, $j = 1, k$. By (3.21) and (3.24) we have

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^0) + \tilde{\psi}^k(x^\perp)) = \tilde{\psi}^k(\widehat{\Theta}_\tau(x^0 + x^\perp))$$

for any $x^0 + x^\perp \in B_{\bar{\delta}_0}^{(1)}$ with $x^0 \in N_\tau^0$ and $x^\perp \in X_\tau^\perp$. Set

$$\widehat{U}_{j\tau} := B_{\bar{\delta}_0}^{(j)}, \quad j = 1, k. \quad (3.25)$$

They satisfy (3.18) and (3.19). Lemma 3.7 is proved. $\square$

Take open convex neighborhoods of 0 in N_τ^0, N_τ^- and X_τ^+ , respectively, $\mathcal{U}_\tau^0, \mathcal{U}_\tau^-$ and $\mathcal{U}_\tau^+$, and an open convex neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}_{k\tau}^+$ of 0 in $X_{k\tau}^+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_\tau &:= \mathcal{U}_\tau^0 \oplus \mathcal{U}_\tau^- \oplus \mathcal{U}_\tau^+ \subset \widehat{U}_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau) \subset \widehat{U}_{k\tau}, \\
\tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^+) &\subset \mathcal{U}_{k\tau}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_{k\tau} := \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^0) \oplus \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^-) \oplus \mathcal{U}_{k\tau}^+ \subset \widehat{U}_{k\tau}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.19) we have the commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{U}_\tau & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\Theta}_\tau} & \widehat{\Theta}_\tau(\mathcal{U}_\tau) \\
\tilde{\psi}^k \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{\psi}^k \\
\mathcal{U}_{k\tau} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\Theta}_{k\tau}} & \widehat{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\mathcal{U}_{k\tau}).
\end{array}$$

and thus

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_*((\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\tau \circ \hat{\Theta}_\tau)_c \cap \mathcal{U}_\tau, (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\tau \circ \hat{\Theta}_\tau)_c \cap (\mathcal{U}_\tau \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*} & H_*((\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau} \circ \hat{\Theta}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap \mathcal{U}_{k\tau}, (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau} \circ \hat{\Theta}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap (\mathcal{U}_{k\tau} \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}) \\
(\hat{\Theta}_\tau)_* \downarrow & & \downarrow (\hat{\Theta}_{k\tau})_* \\
H_*((\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap \hat{\Theta}_\tau(\mathcal{U}_\tau), (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\tau)_c \cap (\hat{\Theta}_\tau(\mathcal{U}_\tau) \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*} & H_*((\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap \hat{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\mathcal{U}_{k\tau}), (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap (\hat{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\mathcal{U}_{k\tau}) \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}).
\end{array}$$

Clearly, for $\bar{\delta}_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, the sets

$$V^{(1)} := \hat{\Theta}_\tau(\mathcal{U}_\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad V^{(k)} := \hat{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\mathcal{U}_{k\tau}) \quad (3.26)$$

satisfy (3.13). Note that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau} \circ \hat{\Theta}_{j\tau} = \hat{\beta}_{j\tau} + \hat{\alpha}_{j\tau}$, $j = 1, 2$, and that $(\hat{\Theta}_{j\tau})_*$ is an isomorphism, $j = 1, 2$. Then for the open subsets $V^{(1)}$ and $V^{(k)}$ in (3.26), Claim 3.6 is equivalent to

Claim 3.8 $\tilde{\psi}^k$ induces an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : H_*((\hat{\beta}_\tau + \hat{\alpha}_\tau)_c \cap \mathcal{U}_\tau, (\hat{\beta}_\tau + \hat{\alpha}_\tau)_c \cap (\mathcal{U}_\tau \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \\
H_*((\hat{\beta}_{k\tau} + \hat{\alpha}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap \mathcal{U}_{k\tau}, (\hat{\beta}_{k\tau} + \hat{\alpha}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap (\mathcal{U}_{k\tau} \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the deformation retracts

$$\begin{aligned}
N_\tau^0 \oplus N_\tau^- \oplus X_\tau^+ \times [0, 1] &\rightarrow N_\tau^0 \oplus N_\tau^- \oplus X_\tau^+, \quad (x^0 + x^- + x^+, t) \mapsto x^0 + x^- + tx^+, \\
N_{k\tau}^0 \oplus N_{k\tau}^- \oplus X_{k\tau}^+ \times [0, 1] &\rightarrow N_{k\tau}^0 \oplus N_{k\tau}^- \oplus X_{k\tau}^+, \quad (x^0 + x^- + x^+, t) \mapsto x^0 + x^- + tx^+
\end{aligned}$$

commute with $\tilde{\psi}^k$. Claim 3.8 is equivalent to

Claim 3.9 $\tilde{\psi}^k$ induces an isomorphism $(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*$ from

$$\begin{aligned}
&H_*((\hat{\beta}_\tau + \hat{\alpha}_\tau)_c \cap (\mathcal{U}_\tau^0 \oplus \mathcal{U}_\tau^- \oplus \{0\}), (\hat{\beta}_\tau + \hat{\alpha}_\tau)_c \cap ((\mathcal{U}_\tau^0 \oplus \mathcal{U}_\tau^- \oplus \{0\}) \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}) \\
\text{to} \quad &H_*((\hat{\beta}_{k\tau} + \hat{\alpha}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap (\tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^0) \oplus \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^-) \oplus \{0\}), \\
&(\hat{\beta}_{k\tau} + \hat{\alpha}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap ((\tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^0) \oplus \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^-) \oplus \{0\}) \setminus \{0\}); \mathbb{K}).
\end{aligned}$$

But $\tilde{\psi}^k : \mathcal{U}_\tau^0 \oplus \mathcal{U}_\tau^- \oplus \{0\} \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^0) \oplus \tilde{\psi}^k(\mathcal{U}_\tau^-) \oplus \{0\}$ is a linear diffeomorphism and

$$(\hat{\beta}_{k\tau} + \hat{\alpha}_{k\tau})(\tilde{\psi}^k(x^0) + \tilde{\psi}^k(x^-)) = k(\hat{\beta}_\tau + \hat{\alpha}_\tau)(x^0 + x^-) \quad \forall x^0 + x^- \in \mathcal{U}_\tau^0 \oplus \mathcal{U}_\tau^-$$

because of (3.17) and (3.20). Claim 3.9 follows immediately. We have proved that the homomorphism in (3.3) is an isomorphism. The other conclusions are easily obtained. Theorem 3.1 is proved. $\square$.

Our proof methods of Theorem 3.1 above can actually give the following abstract result.

Theorem 3.10 *Let H_i be a Hilbert space with inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_{H_i}$ and the induced norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_i}$, and let X_i be a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_{X_i}$, such that X_i is a dense subspace of H_i and that the inclusion $X_i \hookrightarrow H_i$ is continuous, $i = 1, 2$. For an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}_i$ of the origin $\theta_i \in H_i$, suppose that $f_i \in C^{2-0}(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathbb{R})$ has an isolated critical point θ_i and satisfies the PS condition, $i = 1, k$. Also suppose*

that $f_i \in C^2(\mathcal{W}_i \cap X_i, \mathbb{R})$ has an isolated critical point θ_i and satisfies the conditions (FN2)-(FN3) and (CP1)-(CP2) in Section 1, $i = 1, k$. Let $A_i \in C^1(\mathcal{W} \cap X_i, X_i)$ and $B_i \in C(\mathcal{W}_i, L(H_i, H_i))$ be the corresponding maps satisfying (FN2)-(FN3), $i = 1, k$. Assume that the Morse index and nullity $m^-(f_i, \theta_i)$ and $m^0(f_i, \theta_i)$ defined by Definition 1.3, $i = 1, k$, are finite and satisfy

$$m^-(f_1, \theta_1) = m^-(f_2, \theta_2) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0(f_1, \theta_1) = m^0(f_2, \theta_2).$$

(These imply that the negative space H_i^- of $B_i(\theta_i)$ is contained in X_i , $i = 1, k$.) Furthermore, suppose that there exist a constant $k > 0$ and a linear embedding $\psi : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ such that

- (i) $(\psi(x), \psi(y))_{H_2} = k \cdot (x, y)_{H_1} \quad \forall x, y \in H_1$;
- (ii) $\psi(X_1) \subset X_2$ and $\|\psi(x)\|_{X_2} = k\|x\|_{X_1}$ for any $x \in X$;
- (iii) $f_2(\psi(x)) = k \cdot f_1(x) \quad \forall x \in H_1$.

(These imply: $\nabla f_2(\psi(x)) = \psi(\nabla f_1(x)) \quad \forall x \in H_1$, $A_2(\psi(x)) = \psi(A_1(x))$ and $B_2(\psi(x)) \circ \psi = \psi \circ B_1(x)$ for any $x \in X_1$, and thus $\psi|_{H_1^0} : H_1^0 \rightarrow H_2^0$ and $\psi|_{H_1^-} : H_1^- \rightarrow H_2^-$ are linear isomorphisms.) Then for $c_i = f_i(\theta_i)$ and any small $\epsilon > 0$ there exists the topological Gromoll-Meyer pair of f_i at $\theta_i \in H_1$, (W_i, W_i^-) , $i = 1, k$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} (W_1, W_1^-) &\subset (f_1^{-1}[c_1 - \epsilon, c_1 + \epsilon], f_1^{-1}(c_1 - \epsilon)), \\ (W_2, W_2^-) &\subset (f_2^{-1}[c_2 - k\epsilon, c_2 + k\epsilon], f_2^{-1}(c_2 - k\epsilon)), \\ (\psi(W_1), \psi(W_1^-)) &\subset (W_2, W_2^-), \end{aligned}$$

and the homomorphism

$$\psi_* : H_*(W_1, W_1^-; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(W_2, W_2^-; \mathbb{K})$$

is an isomorphism. Consequently,

$$\psi_* : H_*((f_1)_{c_1} \cap U_+^{(1)}, (f_1)_{c_1} \cap (U_+^{(1)} \setminus \{\theta_1\}); \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((f_2)_{c_2} \cap U_+^{(2)}, (f_2)_{c_2} \cap (U_+^{(2)} \setminus \{\theta_2\}); \mathbb{K})$$

is an isomorphism, where $\eta^{(i)}(t, \cdot)$ are the flow of the negative gradient of f_i , and

$$U_+^{(i)} = \bigcup_{0 < t < \infty} \eta^{(i)}(t, W_i), \quad i = 1, k.$$

(This implies that for the topological Gromoll-Meyer pair $(\hat{W}_i, \hat{W}_i^-)$ of f_i at $\theta_i \in H_1$, $i = 1, k$, with $(\psi(\hat{W}_1), \psi(\hat{W}_1^-)) \subset (\hat{W}_2, \hat{W}_2^-)$, the homomorphism

$$\psi_* : H_*(\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_1^-; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(\hat{W}_2, \hat{W}_2^-; \mathbb{K})$$

is an isomorphism.)

By this theorem (or the same proof methods as Theorem 3.1) we can get the following revision of Theorem 4.7 in [12].

Theorem 3.11 *Let $\gamma_0 \in EH_\tau$ be an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau^E$ on EH_τ . If the iteration γ_0^k is also isolated for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and*

$$\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_{1,\tau}^0(\gamma_0),$$

then for $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau^E(\gamma_0)$ and any small $\epsilon > 0$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau^E$ at $\gamma_0 \in EH_\tau$ and of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E$ at $\gamma_0^k \in EH_{k\tau}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (W_\tau, W_\tau^-) &\subset ((\mathcal{L}_\tau^E)^{-1}[c - \epsilon, c + \epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_\tau^E)^{-1}(c - \epsilon)) \quad \text{and} \\ (W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-) &\subset ((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E)^{-1}[kc - k\epsilon, kc + k\epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E)^{-1}(kc - k\epsilon)), \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(\psi^k(W_\tau), \psi^k(W_\tau^-)) \subset (W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-) \quad (3.27)$$

and that the iteration map $\psi^k : EH_\tau \rightarrow EH_{k\tau}$ induces isomorphisms

$$(\psi^k)_* : H_*(W_\tau, W_\tau^-; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-; \mathbb{K}). \quad (3.28)$$

Specially, $(\psi^1)_ = id$, and $(\psi^k)_* \circ (\psi^l)_* = (\psi^{kl})_*$ if the iterations γ_0^l and γ_0^{kl} are also isolated, and*

$$\overline{m}_{1,kl\tau}^-(\gamma_0^{kl}) = \overline{m}_{1,l\tau}^-(\gamma_0^l) = \overline{m}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_{1,kl\tau}^0(\gamma_0^{kl}) = \overline{m}_{1,l\tau}^0(\gamma_0^l) = \overline{m}_{1,\tau}^0(\gamma_0)$$

In the remainder of this section we shall give the revisions of [12, Section 4.3]. The passage from the line below [12, (4.49)] to the end of [12, Section 4] is revised as follows.

Theorem 3.12 *For an isolated critical submanifold $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ in $H_\tau(\alpha)$, suppose that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the critical submanifold $\psi^k(\mathcal{O}) = S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k$ of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ is also isolated, and that*

$$\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0). \quad (3.29)$$

Then for $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau|_{\mathcal{O}}$ and small $\epsilon > 0$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\mathcal{O} \subset H_\tau(\alpha)$ and of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O}) \subset H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-) &\subset ((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}[c - \epsilon, c + \epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c - \epsilon)) \quad \text{and} \\ (\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-) &\subset ((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}[kc - k\epsilon, kc + k\epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc - k\epsilon)), \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(\psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})), \psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-)) \subset (\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-)$$

and that the iteration map $\psi^k : H_\tau(\alpha) \rightarrow H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ induces an isomorphism:

$$\psi_*^k : H_*(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-; \mathbb{K}) \longrightarrow H_*(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-; \mathbb{K}).$$

Proof. Since $\gamma_0 \in C^1(S_\tau, M)$, it is easy to check that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d^2 \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j)([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \xi, [s]_{j\tau} \cdot \eta) = d^2 \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau}(\gamma_0^j)(\xi, \eta) \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in C^1((\gamma_0^j)^* TM).$$

This implies that

$$\overline{m}_{j\tau}^-([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j) = \overline{m}_{j\tau}^-(\gamma_0^j) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_{j\tau}^0([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j) = \overline{m}_{j\tau}^0(\gamma_0^j) \quad (3.30)$$

for any $[s]_{j\tau} \in S_{j\tau}$, $j = 1, k$.

Note that for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ the set

$$N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) := \{ (y, v) \in N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) \mid y \in \psi^j(\mathcal{O}), \|v\|_{j\tau} < j\delta \}$$

is contained in an open neighborhood of the zero section of the tangent bundle $TH_{j\tau}(\alpha)$, $j = 1, k$. By [9, Th.1.3.7, p. 20] we have a C^2 -embedding from $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$ to an open neighborhood of the diagonal of $H_{j\tau}(\alpha) \times H_{j\tau}(\alpha)$,

$$N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \rightarrow H_{j\tau}(\alpha) \times H_{j\tau}(\alpha), (y, v) \mapsto (y, \exp_y v),$$

which restricts to an C^2 -embedding from

$$X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) := N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \cap TC^1(S_{j\tau}, M) \quad (3.31)$$

to an open neighborhood of the diagonal of

$$(H_{j\tau}(\alpha) \cap C^1(S_{j\tau}, M)) \times (H_{j\tau}(\alpha) \cap C^1(S_{j\tau}, M)), \quad j = 1, k.$$

Here $\exp$ is the exponential map of the chosen Riemannian metric on M and $(\exp_y v)(t) = \exp_{y(t)} v(t) \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. This yields a C^2 -diffeomorphism from $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$ to an open neighborhood $Q_{j\delta}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))$ of $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$,

$$\Psi_{j\tau} : N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \rightarrow Q_{j\delta}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})), \quad \Psi_{j\tau}(y, v)(t) = \exp_{y(t)} v(t) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad (3.32)$$

for $j = 1, k$. (Note that it is not the exponential map of the Levi-Civita connection derived the Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{j\tau}$ on $H_{j\tau}(\alpha)$.) Clearly,

$$\Psi_{j\tau}(y, 0) = y \quad \forall y \in \psi^j(\mathcal{O}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_{j\tau}([s]_{j\tau} \cdot y, [s]_{j\tau} \cdot v) = [s]_{j\tau} \cdot \Psi_\tau(y, v) \quad (3.33)$$

for any $(y, v) \in N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$ and $[s]_{j\tau} \in S_{j\tau}$, $j = 1, k$. It follows that $Q_{j\delta}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))$ is an $S_{j\tau}$ -invariant neighborhood of $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$, and that $\Psi_{j\tau}$ is $S_{j\tau}$ -equivariant, $j = 1, k$. We also require $\delta > 0$ so small that $Q_{j\delta}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))$ contains no other critical orbit besides $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$, and that $\Psi_{j\tau}(\{y\} \times N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta))$ and $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$ have a unique intersection point y (after identifying $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$ with the zero section $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$), where

$$N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta) := N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \cap N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y, \quad j = 1, k.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau} := \mathcal{L}_{j\tau} \circ \Psi_{j\tau}$, it is C^{2-0} and satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}([s]_{j\tau} \cdot y, [s]_{j\tau} \cdot v) = \mathcal{F}_{j\tau}(y, v)$$

for any $(y, v) \in N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$ and $[s]_{j\tau} \in S_{j\tau}$, $j = 1, k$. Following [14, Th.2.3] we may construct a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$ as a critical submanifold of $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}$ on $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$,

$$(W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})), W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-), \quad j = 1, k. \quad (3.34)$$

Precisely, choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}$ has no other critical values in $[jc - j\varepsilon, jc + j\varepsilon]$, and then define $h_{j\tau}(y, v) = \lambda \mathcal{F}_{j\tau}(y, v) + \|v\|_{j\tau}^2$, and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) &= (\mathcal{F}_{j\tau})^{-1}[jc - j\varepsilon_1, jc + j\varepsilon_1] \cap (h_{j\tau})_{j\varepsilon_2}, \\ W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^- &= (\mathcal{F}_{j\tau})^{-1}(jc - j\varepsilon_1) \cap W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.35)$$

where positive constants λ , ε_1 and ε_2 are determined by the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(\frac{j\delta}{2}) &\subset W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) \subset N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \cap (\mathcal{F}_{j\tau})^{-1}[jc - j\varepsilon, jc + j\varepsilon], \\ (\mathcal{F}_{j\tau})^{-1}[jc - j\varepsilon_1, jc + j\varepsilon_1] \cap (h_{j\tau})_{j\varepsilon_2} &\subset N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \setminus N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(\frac{j\delta}{2}), \\ (dh_{j\tau}(y, v), d\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}(y, v)) &> 0 \quad \forall (y, v) \in N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta) \setminus N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(\frac{j\delta}{2}) \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, k$. (Note that different from [14] the present $S_{j\tau}$ -action on $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$ is only continuous; but the arguments therein can still be carried out due to the special property of our $S_{j\tau}$ -action and the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}$.)

For any $y \in \psi^j(\mathcal{O})$, $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}|_{N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta)}$ has a unique critical point $0 = (y, 0)$ in $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta)$ (the fiber of disk bundle $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))(j\delta)$ at y), and

$$\begin{aligned} &(W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y, W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y^-) \\ &:= (W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) \cap N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta), W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^- \cap N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}|_{N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y(j\delta)}$ at its isolated critical point $0 = (y, 0)$ satisfying

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &(W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{[s]_{j\tau} \cdot y}, W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{[s]_{j\tau} \cdot y}^-) \\ &= ([s]_{j\tau} \cdot W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y, [s]_{j\tau} \cdot W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_y^-) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.37)$$

for any $[s]_{j\tau} \in S_{j\tau}$ and $y \in \psi^j(\mathcal{O})$, $j = 1, k$. By (3.35) it is easily checked that

$$\psi^k(W(\mathcal{O})_y) \subset W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\psi^k(y)} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi^k(W(\mathcal{O})_y^-) \subset W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\psi^k(y)}^- \quad (3.38)$$

for each $y \in \mathcal{O}$. Clearly,

$$(\widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-) := (\Psi_{j\tau}(W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))), \Psi_{j\tau}(W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-)) \quad (3.39)$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{L}_{j\tau}$ at $\psi^j(\mathcal{O})$, which is also $S_{j\tau}$ -invariant, $j = 1, k$. The following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (W(\mathcal{O}), W(\mathcal{O})^-) & \xrightarrow{\psi^k} & (W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-) \\ \Psi_\tau \downarrow & & \downarrow \Psi_{k\tau} \\ (\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-) & \xrightarrow{\psi^k} & (\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-) \end{array}$$

implies that we only need to prove

Claim 3.13 ψ^k induces an isomorphism

$$(\psi^k)_* : H_*(W(\mathcal{O}), W(\mathcal{O})^-; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-; \mathbb{K}).$$

Recall that the fiber $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{[s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j}$ is the subspace which is orthogonal to $([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j)^\perp$ in $T_{[s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j} H_{j\tau}(\alpha^j)$, $j = 1, 2$. We have a natural bundle trivialization

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_j : N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) &\rightarrow S_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j \times N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}, \\ ([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j, v) &\mapsto ([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j, [-s]_{j\tau} \cdot v) \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

for $j = 1, k$. From this and (3.37)-(3.38) we get the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (W(\mathcal{O}), W(\mathcal{O})^-) & \xrightarrow{\Gamma_1} & (S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-) \\ \psi^k \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi^k \\ (W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-) & \xrightarrow{\Gamma_k} & (S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k \times W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k \times W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}^-) \end{array}$$

So Claim 3.13 is equivalent to

Claim 3.14 ψ^k induces an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi^k)_* : H_*(S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-; \mathbb{K}) &\rightarrow \\ &H_*(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k \times W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k \times W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}^-; \mathbb{K}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\psi^k)_* : H_*(S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k; \mathbb{K})$ is an isomorphism, and

$$\begin{aligned} &H_q(S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^q H_j(S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0; \mathbb{K}) \otimes H_{q-j}(W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-; \mathbb{K}), \\ &H_q(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k \times W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k \times W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}^-; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^q H_j(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^k; \mathbb{K}) \otimes H_{q-j}(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}, W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}^-; \mathbb{K}) \end{aligned}$$

by the Kunneth formula, (it is where we need $\mathbb{K}$ to be a field), Claim 3.14 is equivalent to

Claim 3.15 ψ^k induces an isomorphism

$$(\psi^k)_* : H_*(W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}, W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}^-; \mathbb{K}).$$

This can be obtained by Theorem 3.10 immediately. Another proof of it is as follows. Let $X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) := N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})) \cap TC^1(S_{j\tau}, M)$, i.e.

$$X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j} = N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j} \bigcap C^1([s]_{j\tau} \cdot \gamma_0^j)^* TM, \quad j = 1, k.$$

Then $X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}$ is a Banach space and dense in the Hilbert space $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}$, $j = 1, k$. Denote by

$$X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}(j\delta) := N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}(j\delta) \cap X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}, \quad j = 1, k.$$

Then $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}|_{X(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}(j\delta)}$ is C^2 and satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, $j = 1, k$. (These can be checked as in Section 2). Under the assumption (3.29) it is easily proved that $\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}$ at $0 = (\gamma_0, 0)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{k\tau}|_{N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}(k\delta)}$ at $0 = (\gamma_0^k, 0)$ have the same Morse index and nullity (defined by Definition 1.3), which are equal to

$$\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) - 1 = \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0) - 1,$$

respectively. Let $\eta^{(1)}(t, \cdot)$ and $\eta^{(k)}(t, \cdot)$ be the flows of negative gradients of $\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{k\tau}|_{N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^k}(k\delta)}$, respectively. Note that

$$(W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}, W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}^-)$$

is the Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{F}_{j\tau}|_{N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}(j\delta)}$ at its isolated critical point $0 = (\gamma_0^j, 0)$ as constructed in [4, p.49], $j = 1, k$. Set

$$U_+^{(j)} = \bigcup_{0 < t < \infty} \eta^{(j)}(t, W(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}), \quad j = 1, k.$$

As in the proof above Claim 3.3 we can prove that Claim 3.15 is equivalent to

Claim 3.16 ψ^k induces an isomorphism

$$(\psi^k)_* : H_*((\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\tau)_c \cap U_+^{(1)}, ((\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\tau)_c \setminus \{0\}) \cap U_+^{(1)}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H_*((\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \cap U_+^{(k)}, ((\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{k\tau})_{kc} \setminus \{0\}) \cap U_+^{(k)}; \mathbb{K}),$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j\tau} = \mathcal{F}_{j\tau}|_{N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))_{\gamma_0^j}(j\delta)}$, $j = 1, k$.

This can be proved as in the proof of Claim 3.3. Hence we prove Theorem 3.12 for the Gromoll-Meyer pairs in (3.39). $\square$

Lemmas 4.12, 4.13 in [12] may be revised as the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.17 *If $\gamma_0 \in E_\tau$ is an isolated critical point of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ and $C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma_0; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, then*

$$q - 2n \leq q - \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0) \leq \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) \leq q. \quad (3.41)$$

For an isolated critical orbit $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$, if γ_0 is not constant and $C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, then

$$q - 2n \leq q - \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0) \leq \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) \leq q - 1. \quad (3.42)$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = \phi_\tau^{-1}(\gamma_0)$ be as in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 3.1. Then $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = 0$, $C_q(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma_0; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, and

$$\overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) = m_\tau^-(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0) = m_\tau^0(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0) \in [0, 2n]$$

by (2.12) and (2.13). (3.41) follows from Corollary 1.4 immediately.

For the second conclusion, by (3.39) and (3.40) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\neq C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong H_q(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong H_q(W(\mathcal{O}), W(\mathcal{O})^-; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong H_q(S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, S_\tau \cdot \gamma_0 \times W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong H_{q-1}(W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}, W(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}^-; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong C_{q-1}(\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}, 0; \mathbb{K}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}$ has the Morse index $\overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0)$ and nullity $\overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma_0) - 1$ (defined by Definition 1.3) at its isolated critical point $0 = (\gamma_0, 0)$, the desired claim follows from Corollary 1.4. $\square$

Lemma 3.18 *Suppose that $C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$ for $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma$. If either $\mathcal{O}$ is not a single point critical orbit and $q > 1$, or $\mathcal{O}$ is a single point critical orbit and $q > 0$, then each point in $\mathcal{O}$ is non-minimal saddle point.*

Proof. When $\mathcal{O}$ is a single point critical orbit and $q > 0$, the conclusion follows from [4, Ex.1, p.33].

Now assume that $\mathcal{O}$ is not a single point critical orbit and $q > 1$. By the proof of Lemma 3.17, $C_{q-1}(\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$. Since $0 = (\gamma_0, 0)$ is an isolated critical point of $\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}$ and $q - 1 > 0$, we derive from [4, Ex.1, p.33] that 0 is a non-minimal saddle point of $\mathcal{F}_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\delta)}$. This implies that γ_0 is a non-minimal saddle point of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on the submanifold $\Psi_\tau(N(\mathcal{O})_{\gamma_0}(\epsilon)) \subset H_\tau(\alpha)$ (and therefore on $H_\tau(\alpha)$). $\square$

4 Revisions of Proofs of Main Theorems

4.1. The revision of Theorem 1.1 in [12, Section 5]. All “ $\mathcal{L}_{j\tau}$ is C^2 -smooth” are changed into “ $\mathcal{L}_{j\tau}$ is C^{2-0} ”, $j = 1, k$. All $m_{j\tau}^-$ and $m_{j\tau}^0$ are changed into $\overline{m}_{j\tau}^-$ and $\overline{m}_{j\tau}^0$, $j = 1, k$. Lemma 5.2 in [12] is revised as follows.

Lemma 4.1 *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\gamma'_k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^{k\tau})$ such that*

$$C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma'_k; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad r - 2n \leq r - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma'_k) \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma'_k) \leq r.$$

The passage “Noting (5.4), ..., the desired inequalities follow immediately.” from line 8 from bottom to the end of the proof of that lemma on the page 3011 of [12] is changed into: “The Lemma 3.17 gives the desired inequalities immediately.”

The following lemma is the revision of Lemma 5.3 in [12].

Lemma 4.2 *Without Assumption $F(\alpha)$, let γ_0 be an isolated critical point of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ in $H_\tau(\alpha^\tau)$ such that $\gamma_0^* TM \rightarrow S_\tau$ is trivial. For every integer $q \geq n+1$, let $k(q, \gamma_0) = 1$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) = 0$, and $k(q, \gamma_0) = \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0)}$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) \neq 0$. Assume that γ_0^k is also an isolated critical point of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ for some integer $k > k(q, \gamma_0)$. Then*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma_0^k; \mathbb{K}) = 0.$$

Proof. It follows from Corollary 1.4 that

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma_0^k; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_q(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_{q-\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k)}(\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}),$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ is given by (3.14) and is defined on a manifold of dimension $\overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k) \leq 2n$.

If $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) = 0$, by (2.15) we have $0 \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) \leq n - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k)$ and therefore

$$q - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) \geq q - (n - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k)) \geq 1 + \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0^k).$$

This gives $C_{q-\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k)}(\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) = 0$.

If $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) > 0$, by (2.15) we have $k\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) - n \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k)$ and thus

$$q - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k) \leq q - (k\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) - n) = q + n - k\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0) < 0$$

if $k > \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_0)}$. This also leads to $C_{q-\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0^k)}(\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) = 0$. $\square$

As a direct consequence we get the following revision of Corollary 5.4 in [12].

Corollary 4.3 *Under Assumption $F(\alpha)$, for every integer $q \geq n+1$ there exists a constant $k_0(q) > 0$ such that*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, y; \mathbb{K}) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^{k\tau})$$

for every integer $k \geq k_0(q)$. Here $k_0(q) = 1$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p$, and

$$k_0(q) = 1 + \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j)} \right\rceil \mid \hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) \neq 0, 1 \leq j \leq p \right\}$$

otherwise. $[s]$ denotes the largest integer less than or equal to s .

The others arguments in [12, Section 5] are still valid with necessary replacements for cited results.

4.2. The revision of Theorem 1.4 in [12, Section 6]. All “ $\mathcal{L}_{j\tau}^E$ is C^2 -smooth” are changed into “ $\mathcal{L}_{j\tau}^E$ is C^{2-0} ”, $j = 1, k$. All $m_{1,j\tau}^-$ and $m_{1,j\tau}^0$ are changed into $\overline{m}_{1,j\tau}^-$ and $\overline{m}_{1,j\tau}^0$, respectively, $j = 1, k$. In particular, Lemma 6.2 in [12] and its proof are revised as follows.

Lemma 4.4 *Under Assumption FE , for any integer number $k \geq k_0$, every isolated critical point z of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E$ has the trivial $(n+1)$ th critical module, i.e.*

$$C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E, z; \mathbb{K}) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $z = \gamma_j^k$ and thus $0 = \tilde{z} = \tilde{\gamma}_j^k$ with $0 = \tilde{\gamma}_j = (\phi_\tau^E)^{-1}(\gamma_j)$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.2, from Corollary 1.4 we derive

$$C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E, \gamma_0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_{n+1-\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k)}(\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}^E, 0; \mathbb{K}).$$

Here $\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}^E$ is corresponding to $\hat{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ given by (3.14) and is defined on a manifold of dimension $\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k) \leq 2n$. If $C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^E, \gamma_0; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, then

$$\overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \leq n+1 \leq \overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) + \overline{m}_{1,k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k). \quad (4.1)$$

As in the original proof, it follows from this that

$$2k\hat{\overline{m}}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) - n \leq 2\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \leq 2n+2.$$

Therefore, when $\hat{\overline{m}}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma_j) > 0$, $k \leq \lfloor \frac{3n+2}{2\hat{\overline{m}}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma_j)} \rfloor$, which contradicts to $k \geq k_0$.

When $\hat{\overline{m}}_{1,\tau}^-(\gamma_j) = 0$, (2.19) and (4.1) also give a contradiction. The desired result is proved. $\square$

4.3. The revision of Theorem 1.6 in [12, Section 7]. All $m_{j\tau}^-$ and $m_{j\tau}^0$ are changed into $\overline{m}_{j\tau}^-$ and $\overline{m}_{j\tau}^0$, $j = 1, k$. Lemma 7.2 in [12] is revised as follows.

Lemma 4.5 *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mathcal{O}_k = S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_0 \in \mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^k)$ such that*

$$C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0.$$

Moreover, $r - 2n \leq r - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0) \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0) \leq r$ if γ_0 is constant, and $r - 2n \leq r - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_0) \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_0) \leq r - 1$ if γ_0 is not constant.

Proof. The proof of the first claim is the original one. The others follow from Lemma 3.17. $\square$

Lemma 7.3 in [12] and its proof are revised as follows.

Lemma 4.6 *Under Assumption FT(α), for every integer $q \geq n+1$ there exists a constant $k_0(q) > 0$ such that*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) = 0$$

for every integer $k \geq k_0(q)$ and $\mathcal{O}_k \in \mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^k)$. Here $k_0(q) = 1$ if $\hat{\overline{m}}_r^-(\gamma_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p$, and

$$k_0(q) = 1 + \max \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{q+n}{\hat{\overline{m}}_r^-(\gamma_j)} \right\rfloor \mid \hat{\overline{m}}_r^-(\gamma_j) \neq 0, 1 \leq j \leq p \right\}$$

otherwise.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{O}_k = S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k$. If γ_j is constant, by the proof of Lemma 4.2 we have

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) = C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma_j^k; \mathbb{K}) = 0$$

for any $k > k(q, \gamma_j)$, where $k(q, \gamma_j) = 1$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) = 0$, and $k(q, \gamma_j) = \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j)}$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) \neq 0$.

Suppose that γ_j is not a constant solution. If $C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, Lemma 3.17 yields

$$\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \leq q - 1 \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) + \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k) - 1. \quad (4.2)$$

If $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) > 0$, it follows from (4.2) and (2.16) that

$$k\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) - n \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \leq q - 1$$

and therefore $k \leq \frac{q+n-1}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j)}$. This contradicts to $k \geq k_0(q)$. If $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) = 0$, by (2.16),

$$0 \leq \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \leq n - \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k), \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) + \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k) \leq n \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $q \geq n + 1$, (4.2) implies that $\overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) + \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k) \geq n + 1$. This also gives a contradiction. Lemma 4.6 is proved. $\square$

For the remained proof, besides some necessary replacements for cited results, we change “Under Assumption $FT(\alpha)$ for any $k \in Q$.” in lines 13-17 in [12, p.3022] into:

“Under Assumption $FT(\alpha)$ we apply Lemma 4.5 to all $k \in \{2^m \mid m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}$ to get an infinite subsequence Q of $\{2^m \mid m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}$, some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and an $\gamma \in \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p\}$ such that $C_n(\mathcal{L}_{kl\tau}, S_{kl\tau} \cdot \gamma^{kl}; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$, $\overline{m}_{kl\tau}^-(\gamma^{kl}) = \overline{m}_{l\tau}^-(\gamma^l)$ and $\overline{m}_{kl\tau}^0(\gamma^{kl}) = \overline{m}_{l\tau}^0(\gamma^l)$ for any $k \in Q$. As before we **always assume** $l = 1$ in the following. Then we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} C_n(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) &\neq 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \overline{m}_{k\tau}^-(\gamma^k) &= \overline{m}_\tau^-(\gamma), \quad \overline{m}_{k\tau}^0(\gamma^k) = \overline{m}_\tau^0(\gamma) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.3)$$

for any $k \in Q$.”

References

- [1] A. Abbondandolo, A. Figalli, High action orbits for Tonelli Lagrangians and superlinear Hamiltonians on compact configuration spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, **234**(2007), no. 2, 626–653.
- [2] A. Abbondandolo, M. Schwarz, A smooth pseudo-gradient for the Lagrangian action functional. arXiv:0812.4364v1[math.DS], 2008.
- [3] V. Benci, Periodic solutions of Lagrangian systems on a compact manifold. *J. Differential Equations*, **63**(1986), no. 2, 135–161.
- [4] K. C. Chang, *Infinite Dimensional Morse Theory and Multiple Solution Problem*. Birkhäuser, 1993.
- [5] K. C. Chang, *Methods in Nonlinear Analysis*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer 2005.

- [6] J.J. Duistermaat, On the Morse Index in Variational Calculus, *Advance in Mathematics*, **21**(1976), 173-195.
- [7] A. Fathi, *Weak Kam Theorem in Lagrangian Dynamics*, Pisa, Version 16 February, 2005.
- [8] M. Jiang, A generalization of Morse lemma and its applications, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **36**(1999), 943-960.
- [9] W. Klingenberg, *Lectures on Closed Geodesics*, Springer-Verlag Berlin, 1978.
- [10] C. Li, S. Li, J.Liu, Splitting theorem, Poincaré-Hopf theorem and jumping nonlinear problems, *J. Funct. Anal.* **221**(2005), 439-455.
- [11] Y. Long, Multiple periodic points of the Poincaré map of Lagrangian systems on tori. *Math. Z.*, **233**(2000), 443-470.
- [12] G. Lu, The Conley conjecture for Hamiltonian systems on the cotangent bundle and its analogue for Lagrangian systems, *J. Funct. Anal.* **259**(2009), 2967–3034. arXiv:0806.0425 [math.SG], 3 Jun 2008.
- [13] M. Mazzucchelli, The Lagrangian Conley conjecture, arXiv:0810.2108 [math.DS], 12 Oct 2008.
- [14] Z. Q. Wang, Equivariant Morse theory for isolated critical orbits and its applications to nonlinear problems. *Lect. Notes in Math.* No. 1306, Springer, (1988) 202-221.